

**Appl. No. 09/736,717  
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005  
Reply to final Office action of September 26, 2005**

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants have received the final Office action dated September 26, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; and 2) rejected claims 1-7 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,829) (hereinafter "Van Oorschot").

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11 and 21. Also, Applicants cancel claim 8. Claims 1-7 and 9-21 remain pending. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

#### **I. § 112 REJECTIONS**

The Examiner rejected claims 13-20 as failing to comply with the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In response, Applicants respectfully provide examples in the specification where claims 13-20 are supported. The examples are not all-inclusive and should not be interpreted as limiting the claims. Claim 13 is supported in the specification, at least, on page 13, lines 9-10. Claim 14 is supported in the specification, at least, on page 13, line 24 – page 14, line 27. Claim 15 is supported by the specification, at least, on page 13, line 24 – page 14, line 30. Claim 16 is supported by the specification, at least, on page 17, lines 17-28. Claim 17 is supported by the specification, at least, on page 15, lines 10-17 and page 29, lines 1-20. Claim 18 is supported by the specification, at least on page 10, lines 9-25. Claim 19 is supported by the specification, at least, on page 14, lines 13-15. Claim 20 is supported by the specification, at least, on page 14, lines 16-18. Accordingly, Applicants disagree with the Examiner and submit that claims 13-20 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

#### **II. § 103 REJECTIONS**

Amended claim 1 incorporates the limitations of claim 8, but clarifies the claim language by replacing the phrase "a newly-issued key" with "the reissued key." Accordingly, claim 1 now requires "the applications detect a missing key, and check with the key repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Appl. No. 09/736,717  
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005  
Reply to final Office action of September 26, 2005**

been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key." This limitation is supported in Applicants' specification, at least, on page 9, lines 25-30; pg. 10, line 26 – page 11, line 4; page 19, lines 22-30; page 20, lines 19-23; page 22, lines 18-22; and page 32, lines 1-11. These examples are not all-inclusive and should not be interpreted as limiting the claims. The Examiner previously indicated that claim 8 which included similar language (the phrase "a newly-issued key" in claim 8 has been clarified as "the reissued key" in claim 1) was allowable. Also, none of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, appear to teach or suggest "the applications detect a missing key, and check with the key repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key" as required in claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are allowable.

Amended claim 11, in part, requires "applications in communication with the key repository detect a missing key, and check with the key repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key." The Examiner previously indicated that claim 8 which included similar language (the phrase "a newly-issued key" in claim 8 has been clarified as "the reissued key" in claim 11) was allowable. Also, none of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, appear to teach or suggest "applications in communication with the key repository detect a missing key, and check with the key repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key" as required in claim 11. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 11 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are allowable.

Amended claim 21, in part, requires "the applications detect a missing key, and check with the Key Repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key." The Examiner previously indicated that claim 21 which included similar language (the phrase "a newly-issued key" has been clarified as "the reissued key") was allowable. Also, none of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/736,717  
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005  
Reply to final Office action of September 26, 2005

appear to teach or suggest "the applications detect a missing key, and check with the key repository for the missing key and, if the missing key has been reissued, the applications receive the reissued key" as required in claim 21. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 21 is allowable.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson  
PTO Reg. No. 54,036  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

BEST AVAILABLE COPY